



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,797	02/07/2002	Jeffrey Rodman	199-0093US	3595
29855	7590	04/27/2007	EXAMINER	
WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH, RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI, L.L.P. 20333 SH 249 SUITE 600 HOUSTON, TX 77070			PYZOWA, MICHAEL J	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				2137
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	04/27/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/072,797	RODMAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Michael Pyzocha	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 21-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 21-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 21-40 are pending.
2. Amendment filed 04/20/2007 has been received and considered.

***Claim Objections***

3. The objection to claim 33 has been withdrawn based on the filed amendment.

***Specification***

4. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The specification makes no description of the claimed limitation of "wherein the subsequent transmissions are capable of penetrating the walls of the room".

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 2137

6. Claims 21-29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 21 recites, "wherein the subsequent transmissions are capable of penetrating the walls of the room," nowhere in the specification is there a description of subsequent transmissions being capable of penetrating the walls. The specification only gives support for restricting the transmission within the walls.

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 21-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

9. Claims 21, 30, and 40 recite the phrase "substantially contained" it is unclear as to how far out of the walls'

Art Unit: 2137

perimeter is considered to be substantial. Therefore the claims are rendered indefinite.

10. Any claims not specifically addressed are rejected by virtue of their dependencies.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 21, 22, 24, 25, 30-37, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneier (Applied Cryptography) in view of Parry (US20020164997).

As per claims 21, 30, 31, 37 and 44, Schneier discloses generating a first encryption key within a first device of a communication system; encoding the encryption key to form and encoded encryption key; transmitting the encoded encryption key to a second device (see page 33 step (2)); decoding the encoded encryption key at the second device to extract the encryption key (see page 33 step (3)); and using the encryption key to

Art Unit: 2137

encrypt and decrypt data for subsequent transmissions between the first and second devices (see page 33 step (4)).

Schneier fails to disclose the transmission is wireless and that the devices are contained by walls of a room and that the encoded encryption key is not detectable outside of the walls of the room and the subsequent transmissions are capable of penetrating the walls of the room.

However, Parry teaches a wireless transmission system in which access is only allowed to those confined by the walls of the room and the subsequent transmissions are capable of penetrating the walls of the room (see paragraphs 7, 8, 32, and 55).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to transmit the encoded encryption key of Schneier using the wireless transmission system of Parry.

Motivation to do so would have been to prevent unauthorized access to data in the wireless system (see Parry paragraph 32).

As per claims 22 and 32-35, the modified Schneier and Parry system discloses the use of an acoustic signal (see Parry figure 7 and paragraph 49).

As per claim 24, the modified Schneier and Parry system discloses the use of infrared communications (see paragraph 25).

Art Unit: 2137

As per claims 25 and 36, the modified Schneier and Parry system discloses the use of memory to store the encryption key (see Parry paragraph 21).

13. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Schneier and Parry system as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of Stein, III et al. (US 6297892).

As per claim 23, the modified Schneier and Parry system fails to explicitly disclose that the acoustic signal comprises DTMP tones.

However, Stein, III et al. teaches such an acoustic signal (see column 3 lines 45-53).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art for the acoustic signals of the modified Schneier and Parry system to be DTMF tones.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow for recognition by a phone or fax (see Stein, III et al. column 3 lines 45-53).

14.. Claims 26, 27, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Schneier and Parry system as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Doberstein et al. (US 5809148).

Art Unit: 2137

As per claims 26, 27, and 29, the modified Schneier and Parry system fails to explicitly disclose determining when a request for retransmission, because of an error occurred in connection with the reception or decoding of the encryption key, is needed based on performing error detection.

However, Doberstein et al. teaches determining when a request for retransmission, because of an error occurred in connection with the reception of a message, is needed based on performing error detection (see column 3 lines 3-19).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to determine when a request for retransmission, because of an error occurred in connection with the reception of the encryption key in the modified Schneier and Parry system, is needed based on performing error detection.

Motivation to do so would have been because doing so allows the system to make a request for retransmission of data so that the encryption key can still be built even if data is initially not received properly.

15. Claims 28, 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Schneier and Parry system as applied to claims 21 and 30 above, and further in view of Clough et al. (US 20030054766).

Art Unit: 2137

As per claims 28, 38 and 39, the modified Schneier and Parry system fails to explicitly disclose the use of RF signals for communication between the devices.

However, Clough et al. teaches the use of RF signals for communication (see paragraph 13).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use RF signals in the modified Schneier and Parry communication system.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow for long distance communications.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

16. Applicant's arguments filed 04/20/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that there is no teaching in Parry that the walls play any part in establishing the zone.

With respect to Applicant's argument that there is no teaching in Parry that the walls play any part in establishing the zone, Applicant is referred to paragraph [0055] of Parry which states, "The boundaries of the access zone preferably correspond to physical boundaries such as the walls of a room or building, as well as floors and ceilings as desired. This arrangement simultaneously provides two forms of security since

Art Unit: 2137

a room can prevent unauthorized access by the presence of the walls and locked doors". Therefore, Parry discloses the signal is contained by the walls of the room.

***Conclusion***

17. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Pyzocha whose telephone number is (571) 272-3875. The examiner

Art Unit: 2137

can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm first Fridays of the bi-week off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MJP

  
EMMANUEL L. MOISE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER